

REMARKS

Claims 1-33 are pending in the instant application. Claims 1-33 are rejected.

102 Rejection

Claims 1-8, 11, 14-21, 24 and 27-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Miller et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,421,707). The Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as are set forth in claims 1-8, 11, 14-21, 24 and 27-33 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Miller et al.

The Examiner is respectfully directed to independent Claim 1 which sets forth an embodiment of the present invention including:

...wherein said notifications server is for storing a received electronic mail message and also is for automatically generating, therefrom, a subset of said received electronic mail message; and wherein said notifications server, upon generation of said subset, is for wirelessly transmitting said subset to an identified wireless electronic device associated with a user that is the recipient of said received electronic mail message.

Independent Claims 14 and 27 recite limitations similar to those contained in Claim 1. Claims 2-8, and 11 depend from Claim 1, Claims 15-21 depend from Claim 14, Claims 28-33 depend from Claim 27 and recite further features of the Claimed invention.

Miller et al. does not anticipate or render obvious a communication system that includes a notifications server that generates a subset of a received electronic mail message and that wirelessly transmits “the subset to an identified wireless electronic device associated with a user that is the recipient of said received electronic mail message” as is recited in Claim 1 (Claims 14 and 27 contain similar limitations). Miller et al. only discloses a wireless multi-media messaging communications method and system that does not include the above noted feature. Miller et al. is concerned with the notification by message of individuals that subscribe to the therein disclosed messaging service but is not concerned in anyway with generating a subset of the e-mail messages that are received by the subscribers. More specifically, Miller et al. is concerned with transmitting nothing less than a complete e-mail message.

By contrast Applicants’ Claim 1 (Claims 14 and 27 contain similar limitations) expressly sets forth that a subset of an e-mail message be generated and transmitted to an identified wireless device. Nowhere in the Miller et al. reference is such a limitation taught or suggested. Consequently, the embodiments of the Applicants’ invention as are set forth in Claims 1, 14 and 27 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Miller et al.

Accordingly, the Applicant also respectfully submits that Miller et al. does not anticipate or render obvious the present claimed invention as is recited in Claims 2-8 and 11 dependent on Claim 1, Claims 15-21 dependent on Claim 14, and Claims 28-33 dependent on Claims 27 and that these Claims overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

103 Rejections

Claims 9, 10, 12, 13, 22, 23, 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Miller et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,421,707) in view of Mousseau et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0120696) The Applicant has reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submits that the present invention as is recited in Claims 9, 10, 12, 13, 22, 23, 25 and 26 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Miller et al. in view of Mousseau et al.

The Examiner is respectfully directed to independent Claim 1 which sets forth an embodiment of the present invention including:

...wherein said notifications server is for storing a received electronic mail message and also is for automatically generating, therefrom, a subset of said received electronic mail message; and wherein said notifications server, upon generation of said subset, is for wirelessly transmitting said subset to an identified wireless electronic device associated with a user that is the recipient of said received electronic mail message.

Independent Claim 14 recites limitations similar to those contained in Claim 1. Claims 9, 10, 12 and 13 depend from Claim 1 and Claims 22, 23 and 25 depend from Claim 14.

Miller et al. does not anticipate or render obvious a communication system that includes a notifications server that generates a subset of a received electronic mail message and that wirelessly transmits “the subset to an identified wireless electronic device associated with a user that is the recipient of said received electronic mail message” as is recited in Claim 1 (Claims 14

contains similar limitations). Miller et al. only discloses a wireless multi-media messaging communications method and system that does not include the above noted feature. Miller et al. is concerned with the notification by message of individuals that subscribe to the therein disclosed messaging service but is not concerned in anyway with generating a subset of the e-mail messages that are received by the subscribers. More specifically, Miller et al. is concerned with transmitting nothing less than a complete e-mail message.

By contrast Applicants' Claim 1 (Claim 14 contains similar limitations) expressly sets forth that a subset of an e-mail message be generated and transmitted to an identified wireless device. Nowhere in the Miller et al. reference is such a limitation taught or suggested. Consequently, the embodiments of the Applicants' invention as are set forth in Claims 1 and 14 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Miller et al.

Mousseau et al. does not remedy the deficiencies of Miller et al. outlined above. Mousseau et al. does not anticipate or render obvious a communication system that includes a notifications server that generates a subset of a received electronic mail message and that wirelessly transmits "the subset to an identified wireless electronic device associated with a user that is the recipient of said received electronic mail message" as is recited in Claim 1 (Claim 14 contains similar limitations). Mousseau et al. only discloses a system for pushing information from a host system to a mobile data communications device. Mousseau et al. is concerned with the transmission of information from a host system to a user's mobile data communication device

but is not concerned in anyway with generating a subset of a wireless message for transmission to the user's mobile data communication device.

By contrast Applicants' Claim 1 (Claim 14 contains similar limitations) expressly sets forth that a subset of an e-mail message be generated and transmitted to an identified wireless device. Nowhere in the Mousseau et al. reference is such a limitation taught or suggested. Thus, even if Miller could be modified with Mousseau et al. as suggested in the Office Action, the embodiments of the Applicants' invention set forth in Claims 1 and 14 would not be shown or suggested by the result. Consequently, the embodiments of the Applicants' invention as set forth in Claims 1 and 14 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Mousseau et al.

Accordingly, the Applicants also respectfully submit that Miller in view of Mousseau et al. does not anticipate or render obvious the present claimed invention as is recited in Claims 9, 10, 12 and 13 dependent on Claim 1, and Claims 22, 23 and 25 dependent on Claim 14, and that these Claims overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Conclusion


In light of the above-listed remarks, the Applicants respectfully requests allowance of the remaining Claims.

The Examiner is urged to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Dated: 12/20, 2004

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Anthony C. Murabito', written over a horizontal line.

Anthony C. Murabito
Registration No. 35,295
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060